DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 117 151 TM 005 005

AUTHOR Feigenbaum, Laurel; And Others
TITLE The Effects of Two Different Management Styles on Internal Evaluation or Boss and Evaluator: Conflict or Cooperation?
NOTE 13p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1 58 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Educational Researchers; *Employer Employee Relationship; *Evaluation; *Leadership Styles; *Management; *Professional Personnel; Program Evaluation

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses observations found upon examining district management styles (autocratic vs. democratic) in evaluation offices and evaluation management levels (federal, state, and local) in relationship to the creativity and effectiveness of internal evaluators and usefulness of feedback information to the school site. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED117151

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE EFFECTS OF TWO DIFFERING MANAGEMENT STYLES ON INTERNAL EVALUATORS OR Boss & Evaluator: Conflict or Cooperation?

Laurel Feigenbaum, Noele Krenkel, Terry Anne Steckler
San Francisco Bay Evaluation Group

This paper discusses observations found upon examining district management styles (autocratic vs. democratic) in evaluation offices and evaluation management levels (federal, state and local) in relationship to the creativity and effectiveness of internal evaluators and usefulness of feedback information to the school site.

Introduction

As evaluators, we are often assessing the environments of students and teachers in regards to productivity output, classroom climate and peer interaction. As educators many of us view students as our prime area of concern rationalizing that they, after all, are what schools are all about. Some of us have forgotten that we were yesterday's students and that todays students will be tomorrows working adults - perhaps employed in the same institutions in which most of us presently work. Too often, we have forgotten about ourselves, our own productivity, office climate and peer interactions, as if the mental health and functioning of adults in the educational systems were of less importance than students. We often work in a reactive manner, as though we are pawns of the processes of the institution rather than as initiators/ activists or proactive persons. One reason I believe this to be true, is that we do not examine our work conditions with the same scrutiny or scholarliness that we profess to use as professionals with our clients.

This paper gave three evaluators, the authors, a chance to sit down and reflect upon their experiences and frustrations as employees of an LEA evaluation office in light of management theory. The paper is not meant to be a research paper in a pure sense but rather "food for thought" whereby the participants in this audience might in turn begin to examine their functioning in their own work environments so

TM005 005

that all of us can begin to become proactive persons/initiators rather than reactive persons, totally manipulated by the group process, a growth I believe necessary for evaluators to truly call themselves professional rather than simply bureaucratic employees. We began comparing two programs---Program A is funded by the federal government and administered by the state. It provides supplementary categorical aid funds to an identified group of students within a school district. Students eligible must qualify on both economic and academic criterion. Program B is funded and administered by the federal government. Categorical funds are extended to school districts if they are in the process of desegregation or have plans to desegregate

Leadership/Employee Behavior

Essentially, two types of leadership styles have been identified in the research: one style has been identified with such terms as authoritarian, theory "x", leader centered, exploitive, authoritarian and bureaucratic--employee expectations; the second style has been identified with such terms as participatory, theroy "y", group centered, consultive-participation and professional-employee expectations.

Some studies place these two styles in two discrete categories while others place the two styles on either side of a continuum.

Jack Gibb (1967) identifies and describes two types of leadership styles used by school administrators: authoritarian and participatory. McGregor (1957) describes two types of leadership: theory X which is based on a philosophy of direction and control and theory Y which is based on a philosophy of self-control and self-direction for the employee. Tannenbaum and W.H. Schmidt (1958) describe a "continuum of leadership behavior" ranging from "leader centered" (i.e., use of authority by leader) to "group centered" (i.e., areas of freedom of the group). R. Corwin (1965) has a similar model, (Displays 1 & 2) although it is stated in terms of "employee expectation" rather than "leader behavior". "Bureaucratic employee expectations" as he describes

Display 1
Continuum of Leader Behavior

Leader Centered _____ Group Centered

Leader decides, announces decision	"Sells" decision to group	Announces decision, permits questions	Presents tentative decision, consults group and decides	Presents problem asks for ideas, decides	Presents problem and boundaries, group decides	Gives group as much freedom as he has to define problem and decide

Display 2

CONTRASTS IN THE BUREAUCRATIC-AND PROFESSIONAL-EMPLOYEE PRINCIPLES OF ORGANIZATION

Organizational Characteristics	Bureaucratic-Employee Expectations	Professional-Employee Expectations
Standardization		
Routine of work	Stress on uniformity of clients' problems	Stress on uniqueness of clients' problems
Continuity of procedure	Stress on records and files	Stess on research and change
Specificity of rules	Rules stated as universals; and specific	Rules stated as alternatives; and diffuse
Specialization		
Basis of division of labor	Stress on efficiency of techniques; task orientation	Stess on achievement of goals; client orientation
Basis of skill	Skill based primarily on practice	Skill based primarily on monopoly of knowledge
Authority		
Responsibility for decision making	Decisions concerning application of rules to routine problems	Decisions concerning policy in professional matters and unique problems
Basis of authority	Rules sanctioned by the public	Rules sanctioned by legally sanctioned professions
	Loyalty to the organization and to superiors	Loyalty to professional associations and clients
	Authority from office (position)	Authority from personal competence

them seem to fit very well with "leader centered", while "professional-employee expectations" seem to fit with "group centered" leadership behavior. For example, the basis of authority for bureaucratic employees is "authority from office or position". Whereas the basis of authority for professional employees is more likely to be from personal competence. Bureaucratic employees stress efficiency of technique and task orientation as compared to the professional employee who stresses achievement of goals and client orientation. Corwin contrasts these two dimensions of behavior describing "bureaucratic employee expectations" as "concern for getting the job done" and "professional-employee expectations" as "concern for people". Likert (1967) developed a "Profile of Organizational Characteristics" which describes the same two opposing managerial styles. The terminology he uses to refer to these two dominant leadership behaviors are "exploitive-authoritarian" versus "consultive-participative".

Discussions found in the literature are presently focusing on the importance of matching teaching style and personality type with student learning style for greater productivity and satisfaction. We had wondered if a parallel could be drawn on matching supervisor style with evaluator style. Studies by Fiedler (1973), Carbonari (1973), Tuckman (1969), Grimes and Allinsmith (1961), Feitler, Wiener and Blumberg (1970), Tuckman, Cochran and Travers (1973), McKeachie (1958), Wispe (1951) and Smith (1955) report the relationship between teacher/student personality variables and preferences for open vs. authoritarian classrooms. Fiedler (1973) found that leadership style and its effect on groups or on individual achievement varies with situations, group relations and individual patterns of needs and motives in workers.

McKeachie (1958), Wispe (1951) and Smith (1955) found that college students who preferred structure and showed generally authoritarian tendencies responded more favorably to structured classrooms. Grimes and Allinsworth (1961) found that students who could be described as high compulsive and high anxious also preferred more

authoritarian control; while Tuckman, Cochran and Traver (1973) found that teachers who were comfortable in open classrooms settings were more creative, warmer and accepting, and their students had more positive self-concepts and positive attitudes toward school. Feitler et al (1970) found that students with high control needs preferred more structured situations. Carbonari (1973) found that both teacher and students personality variables are related to preferences for open vs. traditional classrooms.

Positive attitudes toward work and self are as significant for the evaluators as they are for students. Developing and maintaining such an attitude while working in a large impersonal bureaucracy is by and large an uphill battle, and seems to be primarily related to the management style of an immediate supervisor. Drawing comparisons between the experiences of three evaluators working in two separate programs over a period of two years will be used to illustrate this thesis. The discussion will be limited to those aspects of each program which are of immediate concern to the evaluator.

Management Levels

Initially, the levels of management affecting the evaluation process seem to be hierarchical in nature. That is, at the first level or top level is the funding source which imposes varying degrees of evaluation guidelines. At the second level are those immediately responsible for the evaluation, a district supervisor. At the third level are evaluators immediately responsible to the district supervisor for implementation of the evaluation design. The fourth and final level is the field or school site, responsible for implementation (See Display 3) of the program in general, and accountable to the first level for meeting its goals.

Display 3

Levels of Management

Program A	Program B
State/Federal Guidelines (extensive requirements with predetermined goals, specific areas of implementation, and with predetermined State evaluation format)	Federal Guidelines (limited requirement with predetermined goals and no specific areas of implementation)
LEA Supervision (democratic)	LEA Supervision (autocratic)
Evaluator Role/Function (implement predetermined State design, advise and facilitate implementation of school design, implement design determined by evaluation team)	Evaluator Role/Function (implement predetermined design)
Field Use (site implementation of a site designed program)	Field Use (site implementation of a district designed program)

Federal/State Levels

Program A is funded by the federal government and administered by the state. The second program, to be referred to hereafter as program B is funded and administered by the federal government. These programs provide supplementary categorical aid funds to an identified group of students within a school district. Students eligible for A funds must qualify on both economic and academic criterion. Program B funds are extended to a school district if they are in the process of desegregating or have plans to desegregate, and apply to all students affected by the desegregation process.

The A program has extensive requirements in specific instructional and support areas, pre-determined program goals, and a specific evaluation format required by the State administrating agency. The B program, on the other hand, has some limited general goal requirements, no specific instructional areas to be implemented except those imposed by the local educational agency (LEA) receiving the funds, and no evaluation requirements except those developed at the local level.

Under the A program there are aspects of the evaluation design already defined by the State Department of Education which of necessity become part of the tasks of the evaluators. These include pre/post standardized testing, a year-end evaluation report, and verification and documentation of planned activities. The X program only requires that all instruments developed by the LEA for use in the evaluation process be reviewed by the federal administrating agency.

LEA Supervision

Both the A and B programs have a local supervisor or "boss" assigned to oversee the implementation of the evaluation component working with each program.

Theoretically, it would appear that the evaluation component in B would have greater flexibility and input into the development of an evaluation design than it would in program A. However, in reality just the opposite occurred, and it is hypothesized that it was as a result of the differing managerial styles of the two LEA supervisors assigned to each program.

To a great extent the two assigned district supervisors fit the Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) "leader centered" versus "group centered" continuum (See Display 1) and the Likert (1967) managerial style model. The first point on the Tannenbaum-Schmidt continuum is the mark of an authoritarian leader who "makes decisions and announces them", and it describes precisely the leadership characteristics of the supervisor of program B. Although the leadership behavior of supervisor A does not fall precisely at the opposite end of the continuum, in general it tends to be left of center and could be described as alternating between "presents tentative decision subject to change" and "presents problem, gets suggestions, makes decision".

To continue the parallel, assessment data to be collected for program B was based on one evaluation plan designed at the district level by the supervisor without staff consultation. The instruments used during the year to collect implementation data at the site were also designed by the supervisor without staff consultation, although the evaluation staff was responsible for collecting the data. On the other hand, evaluation information for assessment of program A came from three sources: In addition to information required by the state, each school designed as evaluation plan to fit individual program needs in consultation with evaluators, and the evaluation component also developed a plan that could

generate information to be used at the district level for program level decisions. Although supervisor A is consulted during the development of any such design and must finally approve the design, evaluators are encouraged to initiate and develop their own strategies.

Evaluator Role/Function

The authors of this paper worked in both programs and under the supervision of each manager. Under authoritarian management in program B no use was made of the evaluators skills, experience or expertise. Their function was limited to data collection and compilation based on the perceptions and needs of the manager, and although they had the freedom to assist individual schools in the development of assessment instruments few schools needed this service.

Under more democratic leadership in program A, the evaluators role was a participatory one which drew upon individual expertise, allowed for participation in decision making, and conveyed a feeling of concern for the evaluator as a person.

Likert's (1967) previously discussed model, best describes the managerial style of the "group-centered" leader as "concern for people" as opposed to "concern for getting the job done". Likert goes on to report that leaders who display concern for people develop organizations with greater group loyalty, high performance, greater cooperation, more teamwork and sharing, less feeling of pressure, more favorable attitudes toward the supervisor and higher levels of motivation for performance. Leaders who are concerned for getting the task done, i.e., authoritarian, who rely on high-control methods, hierarchical pressures and authority, and programmed, delimited and centalized decision making, breed, according to Likert, less group loyalty, lower performance goals, less cooperation, more conflict, less teamwork and mutual assistance among peers, more feelings of

unreasonable pressures, less favorable attitudes toward supervisors and lower motivational potential for performance. The authors of this paper observed such functioning under program B.

Field Use

The relationship of an evaluator to field personnel is at best a tenuous one, and is often viewed as a threat. If the evaluator's role is limited to implementation of an evaluation design that has had no staff or site input, field reaction is often one of non-cooperation and lack of interest. They sense the task orientation as opposed to the client orientation of the evaluation process.

Another equally important question is the useability of the data collected. This can be a problem present in either managerial style, but is more likely to be one under authoritarian leadership where the evaluator does not have the flexibility or opportunity to effect the kind of data that is collected, the manner in which it is collected or the timing and reporting of the results to the field.

In program B because the evaluation design was developed with no input from the field or staff, the data collected did not provide useable information needed to determine whether or not the program objectives were fully met. It also seems likely that the accuracy of data provided the evaluator by the field is questionable when site personnel have no vested interest in it. Although some of the same problems existed in program A, evaluators because of their input into the evaluation process are more likely to be viewed as assistants or helpers, and were more likely to generate useable data.

Conclusion

In reviewing the experiences of the authors whose greater job satisfaction came when working with a collaborative leader, it at first appeared as if that might be the ideal leadership style for productive evaluation. Upon further consideration and observation, however, it was noted that other evaluators seemed to prefer the more authoritarian style of supervision, and selected it when given a choice.

It was hypothesized as a result, that as with teachers and students, effective organizational functioning might be facilitated by matching employee personality characteristics with appropriate leadership styles. Questions which might be raised though: should one criterion for selection of evaluators be that their skills and attitudes match Corwin's (1965) "professional-employee expectations" due to the nature of the evaluator's job? And should LEA supervision style be that of collaborative due to the special tasks assigned to the LEA managerial level? Perhaps each management level (federal, state, LEA) requires a specific leadership style to fulfill its specific funtions and then perhaps evaluator's characteristics should be matched with that leadership style to facilitate cooperative working conditions within that managerial level.

In conclusion, it appeared that program A, where the evaluator functioned both within a structure imposed by the federal and state guidelines and school site proposals, but also was permitted flexibility within the evaluation component because of the managerial style of the supervisor, provided for effective functioning as a trained professional.

Bibliography

Carbonari, J. An investigation of relationships among instructional mode, teacher needs, and students' personalities. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 1973.

Corwin, Ronald. Professional persons in public organizations. Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 1, No. 3, Autumn, 1965.

Gibb, Jack. In Search of Leaders. American Association for Higher Education. NEA, Washington, D.C., 1967.

Grimes, J., & Allinsmith, W. Compulsivity, anxiety, and school achievement. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1961, 7, 247-271

Feitler, F., Wiener. W., & Blumberg, A. The relationship between interpersonal relations and preferred classroom physical settings. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 1970.

Fiedler, F. The trouble with leadership training is that it doesn't train leaders. Psychology Today, 1973, 6 (No. 9), 23-26, 29-30.

Likert, Rensis. The Human Organization: Its Management and Value. Mc-Graw-Hill New York, 1967.

McGregor, Douglas. The human side of enterprise. The Management Review. 46, 1957.

McKeachie, W. Students, groups, and teaching methods. The American Psychologist, 1958, 13, 580-584.

Smith, D. Fit teaching methods to personality structure. High School Journal, 1955, 39, 167-171.

Tannenbaum, R. & W.H. Schmidt. How to choose a leadership pattern. Harvard Business Review, March-April, 1958.

Tuckman, B. Study of the interactive effects of teaching style and student personality. Proceedings of the 77th annual convention, American Psychological Association, 1969.

Tuckman, B. Cochran, D., & Travers. E. Evaluating the open classroom. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, 1971.

Wispe, L. Evaluating section teaching methods in the introductory course. Journal of Educational Research, 1951, 45, 161-186.